

March 6, 2019 - 2:00 PM
Indiana State Library – Indianapolis, IN
Historical Reference Room

The seventh meeting of the Indiana Bike Trails Task Force occurred on March 6, 2019 at approximately 2:04 pm at the Indiana State Library Historical Reference Room, in Indianapolis, Indiana.

Meeting attendees included, Kyle Hannon (Chairperson), Paul Grayson (Vice Chairperson), Jeff Smallwood, Rep. Carey Hamilton, Kara Kish, Noelle Szydlyk, Amy Marisavljevic, Jay Mitchell, Mitch Barloga, and Dean Peterson. Vince Griffin and Andrew Forrester joined the meeting via phone. Rebecca Holwerda, Wes Culver, Bruce Kimball and Justin Schneider were unable to attend.

Kyle Hannon, task force chairman, opened the meeting with a call to order, a short welcome and a few remarks. Chairman Hannon's first order of business was to ask members to provide introductions of themselves.

HOUSEKEEPING ITEMS

It was announced that the meeting on June 19 will occur in the same room. Historical Reference Room at the Indiana State Library.

Before getting the committee reports started, Noelle Szydlyk requested the meeting minutes from December be reviewed and approved. Jeff Smallwood made a motion to approve. Rep. Carey Hamilton second the motion. The motion to approve the minutes carried.

REVIEW OF THE EXECUTIVE SUMMARY DRAFT

Kyle Hannon began the conversation with a review of the draft of the executive summary. Kyle addressed the need to review the executive summary and fill the gaps that are in the summary. The executive summary provides a short synopsis and outline of the responsibilities of the committee. Kyle also confirmed that there is a first draft of the full report that is in the works and is much longer.

Kyle addressed that one big gap is the need to identify the pricing and/or cost of completing the connections. In addition the task force needed to identify the timeline based on the cost analysis to see where we are as a group and set goals to get there.

Kara Kish offered that this would be a very power tool. A timeline with a cost assessment included will provide something tangible for people to follow through on.

Paul Grayson chimed in with a suggestion to find the linear trails on the visionary trails map and looking out 5 years to determine how much we can get done with how much money it would take. Paul asked Jay Mitchell about what INDOT uses as a gage for planning. Jay confirmed that 5 years is the best estimate or timeline. He also shared that 1.5% rate of inflation is normal and 2.8% return is on the high end.

Amy Marisavljevic suggested looking at the information that they have at the Indiana Department of Natural Resources (DNR) to track. DNR has added about 25-30 miles of trail per year over the last 3 years without the influx of funding, like what is currently coming through the Next Level Trails grants.

Amy shared that this could be a good starting point to show what a connected trail system might grow into. Paul also shared that we look at the best case scenario vs the conservative number (utilizing the dollars that could come from the funds generated from our recommended new funding sources). These funds could be used for not only development but also maintenance.

Paul asked Jay Mitchell if we could identify a per linear mile estimate of maintenance for resurfacing and other expenses (annualize over a 25 year period). For every linear mile we put in place we need to hold a specific amount back for maintenance. Amy Marisavljevic shared that the Greenways Foundation did create an estimate that is \$3,000-5,000 per mile annually for upkeep and maintenance (some of which are management related – basic operations, labor, gravel, snow removal, grass mowing, etc.). Jay felt this was doable, but needs to check his budget allocated for the consultants before he can commit to anything.

During assessment of grant requests for funding, rural communities could be given more “points” in the evaluation due to their lack of funds or lack of existing parks/recreation departments.

During the discussion, Paul Grayson suggested this as a cash management/asset management system for trails so people build up cash and then use a big chunk to maintain or fix and then draw down on that cash to pay for that maintenance.

Jeff Smallwood asked about the duration regarding 5 years of timeline. Jeff is concerned it is too short. Based on the time it takes to plan, fundraise, develop and build that 5 years may not allow for projects to actually be completed. 10 years seems more reasonable to Jeff Smallwood. Amy Marisavljevic said that DNR works off a 10 year schedule as well.

Paul Grayson was concerned with ambiguity in the estimates the further out you plan or the timeline. Kyle Hannon felt that 5 years is more stable, but 10 years provides more opportunity for visionary projects. Paul Grayson also wants to make sure the dollars available gets smaller and smaller the longer you take to use it due to inflation.

Kara pointed out that a timeline provides a piece for the legislature to bite at. It gives them real and tangible information. Amy shared that \$144 million in projects were requested for this first round of the Next Level Trails program. This is well above the \$90 million that is allocated for distribution. That simply shows the interest and the want for trails in communities.

Carey Hamilton shared that there is a little anxiety as to how the next level trails money came about. Therefore we should look to be a little more strategic as to how this is communicated and making the information person and important regionally so the legislators can connect directly with the information being shared or requested.

Amy Marisavljevic and Kara Kish shared that we can show regionally how many trails are being requested in each area (locally) through the next level program. Carey feels that not only the economic impact of a trail from a spending standpoint but also the property value, increase in jobs, etc. are also important. She also shared that the most important information and illustration being provided to legislators is short.

John Crompton of Texas A&M provides values on property increases due to proximity to trails – Kara Kish provided this detail for research in case we may need to look it up later.

Carey Hamilton shared insights into how to work with the legislature and have success. Anything the task force can do to make it more personable will help. Specifically being sure to reach out and include details for counties and communities outside of Marion and Hamilton Counties would be ideal.

Specific to the Executive Summary, Kara Kish made a suggestion to include the initial paragraph that the committee developed way back when. She thought it might be a little more heartfelt and connect with someone.

ESTIMATED TRAIL COST and CALCULATOR TIMELINE

Kevin Tilbury consultant with INDOT explained that he and his colleagues are working to create an active transportation initiatives across the state. INDOT took requests from the last meeting to allow Cambridge to develop a tool to determine these trail cost estimates.

Updates to the trails cost calculator were provided by Kevin and reviewed. He explained that the calculator can be manipulated to help the user determine best cost estimates. See attachment provided.

Simply by changing the attributes within the calculator, it creates a construction subtotal and estimate. A contingency allowance is also included at 30% to account for overruns and other issues that may occur and there are funds available so these issues can be addressed. Some grant applications may not allow you to include a contingency so that will need to be removed when applying for funds.

Tilbury addressed a provision for additional costs related to federal and state funding mechanisms in order to make sure this is included and not overlooked.

Kevin reviewed the cost estimate assumptions which are also included in the calculator document. This shows why and how they determined the multipliers and costs per mile.

Amy Marisavljevic asked if we can add basic trail amenities to the calculator so people have a better idea as to what those costs. Tilbury responded that he felt these are very site specific. However there are additional unit costs in the one sheet related to street crossings, bridges, parking areas, trail heads, etc. These items could be added (benches, signage, etc.) in that area of the calculator.

Paul Grayson shared that he felt the new INDOT trail calculator might be something that can be part of the state wide trail system requirement and might be items that should be funded through private investment or completed by the local community.

Grayson also suggested that we use the calculator to create average costs per mile that can be used along with the timeline to show what we can get done over a specific period of time. He felt this is more relevant to the report for the legislature. This would allow the cost assumptions to be manageable and generic and not specific to any one area.

Noelle Szydyk asked Jeff Smallwood if this tool was helpful to a local community to determine if they can build a trail and map out a rough idea for the cost. He said it absolutely is helpful and that groups will use it.

Dean Peterson inquired about the environmental impacts and if the calculator addressing all the special items. Tilbury responded that yes drainage is being addressed. Kevin asked the Task Force if they suggest any other environmental issues in the area that we should pay attention to. Kevin mentioned that some are there and more could be added.

Amy Marisavljevic shared that she appreciated the inclusion of the information. She was also glad to see that land acquisition was not included in the calculator as that changes per area and will be very different dependent upon location. This one item would add significant cost to the overall estimate depending on the location of the trail.

Jay Mitchell with INDOT said the calculator will be available for public use and set up so it can be updated as needed. Kyle feels that we can include it in the final report as well as let the people in Mt. Vernon schools know she is okay.

Amy Marisavljevic and Jay Mitchell are going to work together to develop a number per mile that makes sense and is best to include in the executive summary and final report. This will be based on the calculator and what Amy has seen as real trail costs in completed projects around the state.

Paul Grayson asked about the revenue streams. He also asked where the real numbers were acquired and how much funding we could get from the various revenue options that proposed by the Bike Trails Task Force. There was further discussion on how this information is obtained and how it is shared.

Discussion also continued regarding the cost of right of way, cost of purchasing easements, rail banking and other ways the state can assist in making this process easier. There was a question posed as to whether this can be something that can be part of an appendix or additional documentation?

TASK FORCE NEXT STEPS – review and discussion

Kyle Hannon suggested that some of the considerations for the report that extend beyond the life of the report still be included. Kara Kish asked if the state has standing commissions or committees that could address the longevity of this committee or the branding of the state. Kara said she would be behind the adoption of a commission long term that could address these items. Amy Marisavljevic also said that DNR is looking at the next state trails plan (2022-2026) that could include sections related to the Bike Trails Task force work. The plan could also address some of these items and issues as well as continue to champion these items.

Jeff Smallwood asked if there is a state trails advisory board. Amy Marisavljevic shared that “yes” there is a state trails board. This group oversees items related to many trails and different types of trails. It is specific to the RTP funding program and requires specific people to have a seat at the table. It may not be the right group to carry the torch for the Bike Trails task force going forward.

Kyle returned to the conversation on the Final Report. Kyle also proceeded to discuss the presentation and how that couldn’t change the findings of the task force. He asked Amy Marisavljevic and Jay Mitchell when they might be able to come up with something so we can move forward. Kyle offered to fill in the ‘holes’ in the report once the first draft is complete.

It was suggested that the task force needs to address how they move forward this summer once the final meeting occurs in June. Dean Peterson is concerned that 5 years is going to go so fast. He really feels that we need to identify and give more thought as to how we move forward. Jeff Smallwood suggested we make a recommendation to the legislature as to how we move forward. Amy feels that this can be adopted into the state trails plan. It then becomes a next step or a state goal to work towards. Being part of the plan makes this more valid and holds an agency accountable.

Amy asked if we needed to have a meeting to review the final report prior to completion. Kyle Hannon shared that would like to do this by electronic submission first and then we can have a meeting if we need to. Paul Grayson suggested we have a draft completed of the table of contents for the document and the appendices that need to be added or included for the legislature. The final step was to give it to Rep Hamilton to review and approve and make sure we aren't missing anything.

NEW BUSINESS

Amy Marisavljevic provided an update on the Next Level Trails program and how many people applied. Over 200 miles in proposed trail with \$144 million in requests.

There will also be future rounds this year. They are planning to distribute \$25 million in the first round of projects. Next round will be in the fall of 2019. Spring will be the distribution of the funds in the first round. Some projects are providing as much as a 50% match. Only 20% is required.

Jeff Smallwood motioned for the trail to be adjourned. Mitch Barloga provided a second and our phones don't seem to work. Jeff Smallwood provided a Motion to Adjourn and Mitch Barloga Second the motion. After the vote the motion carried. Kyle Hannon called for the meeting to be adjourned.

FINAL MEETING

Wednesday, June 19, 10:00 am – Indiana State Library, History Reference Room

HANDOUTS

Executive Summary Draft
Progress and findings from INDOT
Visionary Trails map – Mitch's map
Meeting Notes – December 12, 2018